

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

These remarks are responsive to the Office Action dated January 31, 2007. Claims 1-3, 5-15, 18-27, 29-37, 39-48, 50-53, 55-66 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-59 are rejected. Claims 1, 3, 9, 12-14, 22-26, 29, 31, 33-36, 39, 41, 43-46, 48, 50-53, and 55-59 have been changed, claims 4, 16-17, 28, 38, 49, and 54 have been cancelled, and claims 60-66 have been added by this amendment.

The amendments and new claims are supported by the specification. Claims 1, 14, 26, 36, 46, and 53 have been amended to recite a plurality of selectable items responsive to user input, wherein each of the selectable items describes a different filtering criterion and corresponds to a different range of values, and wherein the different ranges of values for the selectable items are based on the file objects present in a file object set that is being filtered for display of the file objects, as supported in the specification, for example, on page 7, lines 4-14; page 8, lines 17-23; page 9, lines 1-13; and original claims 12, 13, 24, 25, 34, 35, 44, 45, 51, 52, 58 and 59. Claims 12, 23, 34, 44, 50, and 57 are supported similarly. Claims 24, 51, 58, 60, and 63 recite that the different ranges of values for the selectable items are determined between the highest and lowest values of the selected characteristic in the file object set, as disclosed, for example, on page 9, lines 1-13. Claims 61, 62, and 64-66 recite that the different ranges of values for the selectable items are based on the distribution of the actual values of the associated characteristic in the file object set, where the different ranges are evenly divided between two extreme values that surround at least some of the actual values of the associated characteristic, as similarly support on page 9, lines 1-13.

Other claim amendments are provided in accordance with parent claims and/or include features recited in previously-existing claims. All changes are therefore fully supported by

Applicant's specification.

Oath/Declaration

The Examiner stated that the oath or declaration is defective because it does not identify the citizenship of each inventor. It is noted that the citizenship of one inventor is not identified. Accordingly, a supplemental oath/declaration signed by that inventor is submitted herewith, stating the missing citizenship for the inventor.

Specification

The Examiner objected to the Specification, stating that the sentence starting at page 11, line 8 refers to Fig. 1, and that clarification is required. Applicant has amended the specification to change "Fig. 1" to "Fig. 2" as suggested by the Examiner, and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to the preamble of claim 53, indicating that the phrase, "the method comprising" is unclear. Accordingly, Applicant has amended the phrase to recite "the system comprising," and requests that the objection be withdrawn.

102 Rejections

The Examiner rejected claims 1-59 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by De Vorchik et al, Patent No. 6,279,016 ("De Vorchik"). Applicant has amended the claims to clarify the invention.

Claim 1 recites a method for or using filtering criteria in the display of file objects in a graphical user interface (GUI) including displaying a plurality of selectable items responsive to user input, where each of the selectable items describes a different filtering criterion and corresponds to a different range of values, and where the different ranges of values for the selectable items are based on the file objects present in a file object set that is being filtered for display of the file objects. User input is received to the at least one selected item of the selectable items, and the display of the file objects in the file object set is filtered according to the user input and the at least one selected item.

De Vorchik discloses a filtering control in which the user may select attributes of a data set and filter the data set in a displayed control. De Vorchik allows a user to input query terms to a custom control that shows non-textual selections (Fig. 10), unique values (Fig. 11), or calendar dates (Figs. 14-15).

Applicant's claim 1, in contrast, recites that each selectable item corresponds to a different range of values, where the different ranges of values for the selectable items are based on the file objects present in a file object set that is being filtered for display of the file objects. De Vorchik does not disclose providing selectable items corresponding to different ranges of values based on the file objects to be filtered. For example, De Vorchik discloses a color menu in Fig. 10, but the color menu does not have items based on the data set to be filtered-- the color menu includes the entire color spectrum, regardless of the data set to be filtered (col. 9, lines 44-45). De Vorchik's calendar selection of Figs. 14-15 always displays the same standard calendar days to select from, and does not have selections with different ranges, those ranges based on the data set to be filtered (col. 10, lines 11-19). De Vorchik's other selection menus, such as the unique value menu of Fig. 11, do not provide selectable items that each correspond to a different range of values, as recited by Applicant. Applicant's invention has the advantage of providing selections

for different ranges of values that correspond to the file object set that is to be filtered, so that, for example, the ranges of the selections from which the user can select are more relevant to the file objects and thus it is easier to find a desired filtering range.

The Examiner stated with respect to claim 13 that De Vorchik discloses that different ranges in the menu are based on actual ranges of the associated characteristic of the displayed file objects, at col. 10, lines 11-18. However, these lines describe the calendar selections of Figs. 14-15, and as explained above, these calendar date selections are always displayed as individual days of a standard calendar regardless of the data set to be filtered. In this calendar selection, De Vorchik does not provide selectable items, each item corresponding to a different range of values that is based on the file objects to be filtered.

Applicant therefore believes that claim 1 is patentable over De Vorchik. Claims 2, 3, and 5-13 are dependent on claim 1 and are patentable over De Vorchik for at least the same reasons as claim 1, and for additional reasons.

Claim 14 recites a method for using filtering criteria that includes displaying a menu of selectable filtering criteria for the selected characteristic, where the selectable filtering criteria includes a plurality of selectable items responsive to user input, where each of the selectable items describes a different filtering criterion and corresponds to a different range of values, and where the different ranges of values for the selectable items are based on the file objects present in a file object set that is being filtered for display of the file objects. Applicant believes claim 14 is patentable over De Vorchik for reasons similar to those explained above for claim 1. Claims 15, 18-25 are dependent on claim 14 and are patentable over De Vorchik for at least the same reasons as claim 14, and for additional reasons. For example, claim 24 recites that the different ranges of values for the selectable items are determined between the highest and lowest values of

the selected characteristic in the file objects being filtered. As explained above, De Vorchik does not disclose or suggest determining a different range for each item, the range based on a characteristic of file objects being filtered.

Claim 26 recites a computer-readable storage medium including filtering features similar to those of claims 1 and 14, and is therefore believed patentable over De Vorchik for at least similar reasons as claims 1 and 14. Claims 27 and 29-35 are dependent on claim 26 and are patentable over De Vorchik for at least the same reasons as claim 26, and for additional reasons.

Claim 36 recites a system including filtering features similar to those of claims 1 and 14 and is therefore believed patentable over De Vorchik for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 37 and 39-45 are dependent on claim 36 and are patentable over De Vorchik for at least the same reasons as claim 36, and for additional reasons.

Claim 46 recites a computer readable medium including filtering features similar to those of claims 1 and 14 and is therefore believed patentable over De Vorchik for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 47, 48, 50-52 are dependent on claim 46 and are patentable over De Vorchik for at least the same reasons as claim 46, and for additional reasons as explained above.

Claim 53 recites a system including filtering features similar to those of claims 1 and 14 and is therefore believed patentable over De Vorchik for at least similar reasons as claim 1. Claims 55-59 are dependent on claim 53 and are patentable over De Vorchik for at least the same reasons as claim 53, and for additional reasons as explained above.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant submits that claims 1-3, 5-15, 18-27, 29-37, 39-48, 50-53, and 55-59 are patentable over De Vorchik, and respectfully requests that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

New Claims

New claims 60-66 have been added by this amendment. These are dependent claims and are believed patentable over De Vorchik for at least the same reasons as their respective parent claims, and for additional reasons. For example, claims 60 and 63 recite that the different ranges of values for the selectable items are determined between the highest and lowest values of the associated characteristic in the file object set, which is patentable over De Vorchik as described above for similar claims 24, 51, and 58. Claims 61, 62, and 64-66 recite that the different ranges of values for the selectable items are based on the distribution of the actual values of the selected characteristic in the file object set, wherein the different ranges are evenly divided between two extreme values that surround at least some of the actual values of the selected characteristic. This is not disclosed or suggested by De Vorchik, who does not disclose selectable items that each correspond to a different range of values, the value based on the file objects being filtered, as explained above.

Applicants' attorney believes this application in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, Examiner is invited to call Applicants' attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP

April 30, 2007

/Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr./
Joseph A. Sawyer, Jr.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 30,801
(650) 493-4540